



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/020,470

10/30/2001

Wei-Qiang Michael Gui

13768.209

9272

47973

7590

04/04/2008

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT

1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER

60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

DEBNATH, SUMAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/020,470	Applicant(s) GUI ET AL.	
	Examiner SUMAN DEBNATH	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 22-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 22-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 and 22-45 are pending in this application.
2. Claims 1, 9, 13, 30-32 and 39 are presently amended.
3. Claim 45 has been newly presented in the amendment filed 19 December 2007.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/19/2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1-8, 10-14, 22-26, 28-34, 36-44 are objected to because of the following informalities:
Claim 1 recites "the credential store" in line 17. It is objected to for lack of antecedent basis.
In claims 2-8, 10-14, 22-26 and 41-44, "A method" should be "The method."
In Claims 28-34 and 36-10, "A computer program product" should be "The computer program product."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2135

7. Claims 27-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner asserts that the limitation of claims 27-40 raise a question as to whether or not the, the limitation actually claims the program or not. The claims 27-40 recites, "The computer program product" which could be a program/software/set of instructions. The claims would have established a statutory category of the invention if the program recited in the claims were stored on an appropriate medium and perform the function recited on the body of the claims when the program is read and executed by the computer/processor. However, the above claims are simply a computer program product which could be a software and thus do not clearly establish a statutory category of the invention.

Therefore the claims 27-40 are a program per se and don't fall within the statutory classes listed in 35 USC 101. The language of the claim(s) raises a question whether the Claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to an environment or machine which would result in a practical operation producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject-matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759, 1760).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 27, 30-32, 35-37, 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh et al. (Patent No.: US 6,959,336 B2) (hereinafter "Moreh") and further in view of

Sweet et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0031230 A1) (hereinafter "Sweet") and Laursen et al. (Patent No.: 6,065,120) (hereinafter "Laursen").

10. As to claim 1, Moreh discloses in a system including a service that is accessed by a user from one or more devices with varying input capabilities, a method for associating multiple credentials with a single user account such that the user may be authenticated with any one of the multiple credentials (abstract), the method comprising an authentication system performing acts of:

- receiving an authentication request at the authentication system from a device, wherein the authentication request includes credentials of the user (FIG. 1, col. 5, lines 45-50 and col. 6, lines 5-10);

- validating the credentials provided by the user, wherein the credentials are associated with a single unique user identifier of the user (col. 6, lines 10-20),

- receiving new credentials from the user, wherein the new credentials are associated with the same unique_user identifier of the user (col. 6, lines 32-40),

- storing the new credentials in a credential store of the authentication system such that the authentication system can authenticate the user to the service when the user provides any one of the multiple credentials (col. 6, lines 32-50); and

Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose that the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device; the credentials are associated with a single unique user identifier, a user account, and a user profile, providing, in response to the request the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device. However, Sweet discloses that the credentials are associated with a single unique user identifier, a user account, and a user profile ([0025], [0026], [0039],

lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26), providing, in response to the request the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device ([0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to “provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])”

Neither, Moreh nor Sweet explicitly discloses the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device. However, Laursen discloses the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device (col. 3, lines 4-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh and Sweet as taught by Laursen in order to support credential service to "a mobile device that typically has a keypad with a few buttons, much less functional compared to a keyboard in a personal computer system (Laursen, col. 2, lines 18-23)."

11. As to claim 4, Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose wherein the act of receiving new credentials from the user further comprises an act of symmetrically associating the new credentials with a unique user identifier. However, Sweet discloses wherein the act of receiving new credentials from the user further comprises an act of symmetrically associating the new credentials with a unique user identifier ([0025], [0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to “provide a system design which

is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])”

12. As to claim 5, Moreh doesn’t explicitly disclose wherein the act of symmetrically associating the new credential with a unique_user identifier further comprises an act of associating the new credentials with a user account. However, Sweet discloses wherein the act of symmetrically associating the new credential with a unique_user identifier further comprises an act of associating the new credentials with a user account ([0025], [0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to “provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])”

13. As to claim 9, Moreh discloses in a system that includes multiple services that are accessed by a user over a network such as the Internet, wherein the user accesses the multiple services from one or more devices that have varying input capabilities, a method for accessing a service from a device (abstract), the method comprising acts of:

providing multiple credentials to an authentication system, wherein each of the multiple credentials that is maintained by the authentication system (FIG. 1, col. 6, lines 10-56);

requesting access to a service using a device included in the one or more devices, wherein the service requires that the user be authenticated before access to the service is granted to the user, wherein the device is redirected to the authentication system (col. 5, lines 38-56 and col. 6, lines 7-20);

selecting an access credential to send to the authentication system from the multiple credentials and entering the access credential in the device (col. 6, lines 62-67 to col. 7, lines 1-4);

issuing an authentication request to an authentication system, wherein the authentication request includes the access credential selected by the user (col. 7, lines 15-28, col. 9, lines 49-52);

receiving an authentication response from the authentication system, wherein the authentication response includes the unique user identifier that authenticates the user to the service if the access credential is validated (col. 6, lines 13-20); and

sending an authenticated request to the service, wherein the authenticated request includes the unique user identifier such that access to the service is obtained (col. 6, lines 13-25).

Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose that the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device; each of the multiple credentials is associated with a user account, a unique user identifier and a user profile. Authentication response also including profile and sending authenticated request with user profile. However, Sweet discloses that each of the multiple credentials is associated with a user account, a unique user identifier and a user profile ([0025], [0026], [0040]). Authentication response also including profile and sending authenticated request with user profile ([0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to "provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate

information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])."

Neither, Moreh nor Sweet explicitly discloses the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device. However, Laursen discloses the credentials being selected by the user from among a plurality of credentials based at least partially on the user's device (col. 3, lines 4-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh and Sweet as taught by Laursen in order to support credential service to "a mobile device that typically has a keypad with a few buttons, much less functional compared to a keyboard in a personal computer system (Laursen, col. 2, lines 18-23)."

14. As to claim 10, Moreh discloses wherein the act of selecting an access credential to send to an authentication system from multiple credentials further comprises an act of selecting the access credential according to an input capability of the device (col. 6, lines 62-67 to col. 7, lines 1-4).

15. As to claim 11, Moreh discloses wherein the access credential is a numerical credential when the device has numerical input (col. 6, lines 62-67 to col. 7, lines 1-4).

16. As to claim 27, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

17. As to claim 30, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 4.

18. As to claim 31, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 5.

19. As to claim 35, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 9.
20. As to claim 36, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 10.
21. As to claim 37, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 11.
22. As to claim 41, Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose wherein the same unique user identifier is provided to the user regardless of the credentials received from the user. However, Sweet discloses wherein the same unique user identifier is provided to the user regardless of the credentials received from the user ([0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to "provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])"

23. As to claim 42, Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose wherein different credentials are required from each of the one or more devices. However, Sweet discloses wherein different credentials are required from each of the one or more devices ([0028]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to "provide a system design which

is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])”

24. As to claim 43, Moreh doesn’t explicitly disclose wherein providing the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device comprises sending a cookie containing the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device. However, Sweet discloses wherein providing the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device comprises sending a cookie containing the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device ([0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to “provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020])”

25. As to claim 44, Moreh doesn’t explicitly disclose wherein the user profile includes data about the user comprising name, personal information, preferred language, preferences, and location. However, Sweet discloses wherein the user profile includes data about the user comprising name, personal information, preferred language, preferences, and location.

As to claim 45, Neither, Moreh nor Sweet explicitly discloses wherein the act of validating the credentials provided by the user further comprises an act of the authentication system comparing the credentials

selected by the user against the credentials stored in the credential store to determine validity. However, Laursen discloses wherein the act of validating the credentials provided by the user further comprises an act of the authentication system comparing the credentials selected by the user against the credentials stored in the credential store to determine validity (col. 3, lines 4-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh and Sweet as taught by Laursen in order to support credential service to "a mobile device that typically has a keypad with a few buttons, much less functional compared to a keyboard in a personal computer system (Laursen, col. 2, lines 18-23)."

26.

27. As to claim 6, neither Moreh nor Sweet explicitly disclose wherein the act of symmetrically associating the new credential with a unique user identifier further comprises an act of caching a copy of the unique user identifier with the new credential. However, Laursen discloses wherein the act of symmetrically associating the new credential with a unique user identifier further comprises an act of caching a copy of the unique user identifier with the new credential (FIG. 2b, col. 8, lines 4-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh and Sweet by including an act of caching a copy of the user identifier with the new credential as taught by Laursen in order to perform transactions or retrieve pertinent information without the need to key in such every time the transactions or the information are desired.

28. As to claim 32, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 6.

29. Claims 2-3, 8, 12, 22, 25-26, 28-29, 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Laursen and Wood et al. (Patent No.: US 6,609,198 B1) (hereinafter "Wood").

30. As to claims 2, Moreh discloses wherein the act of receiving an authentication request at the authentication system further comprises an act of determining where to send the credentials for validation (col. 6, lines 10-20). Neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly disclose that the authentication system is a distributed authentication system. However, Wood discloses that the authentication system is a distributed authentication system (col. 17, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Wood in order to provide enhanced security to the credential repository with location transparency.

31. As to claim 3, Moreh discloses wherein the act of determining where to send the credentials for validation uses a username of the credentials (col. 6, lines 5-55).

32. As to claim 8, Moreh discloses further comprising one or more of:

a step for remembering which credential was received in the authentication request (col. 6, lines 5-40);

Neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly discloses a step for prompting the user for a more secure credential when the credentials received in the authentication request do not meet security requirements of the service; and a step for providing at least one security measure for each credential

associated with the user account, wherein the user is not authenticated to a service if the security measure of a particular credential is breached or the user account is locked. However, Wood discloses a step for prompting the user for a more secure credential when the credentials received in the authentication request do not meet security requirements of the service (col. 10, lines 25-65); and a step for providing at least one security measure for each credential associated with the user account, wherein the user is not authenticated to a service if the security measure of a particular credential is breached or the user account is locked (col. 10, lines 30-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Wood in order to provide credentials without loss of session continuity.

33. As to claim 12, neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly disclose the method further comprising:

an act of requiring the user to provide a secure credential to the authentication system that is more secure than the access credential; and

an act of providing the service with a level of security of the secure credential and of the access credential, wherein the service is unaware of both the selected credential and the secure credential.

However, Wood discloses an act of requiring the user to provide a secure credential to the authentication system that is more secure than the access credential (col. 10, lines 25-65); and

an act of providing the service with a level of security of the secure credential and of the access credential, wherein the service is unaware of both the selected credential and the secure credential (col. 10, lines 25-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Wood in order to provide credentials without loss of session continuity.

34. As to claim 22, Moreh doesn't explicitly disclose wherein the new credential has an associated security level and wherein the method further comprises:

associating the new credential with the user account such that the user can be authenticated with both the original credential and the new credential,

prior to providing the response, and subsequent to receiving the authorization request, prompting the user for a secure credential that is more secure than the original credential if the security level of the original credential is insufficient for a service being accessed by the user, wherein the service is provided with the security level of both the original credential and the secure credential, but is not aware of either the original credential or the secure credential.

However, Sweet discloses wherein the new credential has an associated security level and wherein the method further comprises:

associating the new credential with the user account such that the user can be authenticated with both the original credential and the new credential ([0025], [0026], [0040]). Authentication response also including profile and sending authenticated request with user profile ([0026], [0039], lines 4-7, [0040], lines 20-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh as taught by Sweet in order to "provide a system design which is substantially more compatible with a broad number of Internet-based applications in the corporate

information protection, content vending, entertainment, and telecommunications (wireless systems) fields. (Sweet, [0020]).”

Neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly discloses prior to providing the response, and subsequent to receiving the authorization request, prompting the user for a secure credential that is more secure than the original credential if the security level of the original credential is insufficient for a service being accessed by the user, wherein the service is provided with the security level of both the original credential and the secure credential, but is not aware of either the original credential or the secure credential.

However, Wood discloses prior to providing the response, and subsequent to receiving the authorization request, prompting the user for a secure credential that is more secure than the original credential if the security level of the original credential is insufficient for a service being accessed by the user, wherein the service is provided with the security level of both the original credential and the secure credential, but is not aware of either the original credential or the secure credential (col. 10, lines 25-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Wood in order to provide credentials without loss of session continuity.

35. As to claim 25, Moreh discloses further comprising a step for automatically authenticating the user at different services after the user has been authenticated at a first service (col. 15, lines 10-30, “....federated authentication source that ultimately leads to global single sing-on”).

36. As to claim 26, Moreh discloses wherein the original credential is a numerical credential when the device has a preferred numerical input (col. 6, lines 62-67 to col. 7, lines 1-4).

37. As to claim 28, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 2.

38. As to claim 29, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 3.

39. As to claim 34, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 8.

40. As to claim 38, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 12.

41. Claims 7, 14, 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Laursen and Leah et al. (Patent No.: US 6,986,039 B1) (hereinafter "Leah").

42. As to claim 7, neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly disclose wherein the act of receiving new credentials from the user further comprises an act of asymmetrically associating the new credentials with a primary credential, wherein the primary credential is stored in a primary store with the unique user identifier. However, Leah discloses wherein the act of receiving new credentials from the user further comprises an act of asymmetrically associating the new credentials with a primary credential, wherein the primary credential is stored in a primary store with the unique user identifier (FIG. 3, col. 10, lines 48-67 to col. 11, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Leah in order to synchronize credentials securely and propagate among multiple directories, operating system platforms and registries.

43. As to claim 14, neither Moreh nor Sweet and Laursen explicitly disclose wherein the authentication system is a distributed system and wherein some of the multiple credentials are stored on different credential stores, wherein the act of providing multiple credentials to an authentication service further comprises an act of asymmetrically associating the multiple credentials with a primary credential, wherein the unique user identifier is stored with the primary credential.

However, Leah discloses wherein the authentication system is a distributed system and wherein some of the multiple credentials are stored on different credential stores, wherein the act of providing multiple credentials to an authentication service further comprises an act of asymmetrically associating the multiple credentials with a primary credential, wherein the unique user identifier is stored with the primary credential (FIG. 3, col. 10, lines 48-67 to col. 11, lines 1-10, which describes validating credentials with master credentials).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Leah in order to synchronize credentials securely and propagate among multiple directories, operating system platforms and registries.

44. As to claim 33, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 7.

45. As to claim 40, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 14.

46. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Laursen Wood and Leah.

47. As to claim 23, neither Moreh nor Sweet, Laursen and Wood explicitly discloses wherein the step for associating new credential with the user account further comprises a step for symmetrically associating the original credential and the new credential with the user account, wherein the user account is cached with each of the original credential and the new credential.

However, Leah discloses wherein the step for associating new credential with the user account further comprises a step for symmetrically associating the original credential and the new credential with the user account, wherein the user account is cached with each of the original credential and the new credential (col. 10, lines 48-67 to col. 11, lines 1-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet, Laursen and Wood as taught by Leah in order to synchronize credentials securely and propagate among multiple directories, operating system platforms and registries.

48. As to claim 24, neither Moreh nor Sweet, Laursen and Wood explicitly discloses wherein the step for associating the new_credential with the user account further comprises a step for asymmetrically associating the new credential with a primary credential, wherein the primary credential is associated with the user account and wherein the primary credential is cached with each new credential.

However, Leah discloses wherein the step for associating the new_credential with the user account further comprises a step for asymmetrically associating the new credential with a primary credential, wherein the primary credential is associated with the user account and wherein the primary credential is cached with each new credential (col. 10, lines 48-67 to col. 11, lines 1-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet, Laursen and Wood as taught by Leah in order to synchronize credentials securely and propagate among multiple directories, operating system platforms and registries.

49. Claims 13 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Laursen and Wood.

50. As to claim 13, neither Moreh nor Sweet explicitly disclose wherein the authentication system is a distributed system and wherein some of the multiple credentials are stored on different credential stores, wherein the act of providing multiple credentials to an authentication service further comprises one or more of: a step for symmetrically associating the multiple credentials with the unique user identifier, wherein the use identifier is cached with each of the multiple credentials; a step for symmetrically associating the multiple credentials with a user account, wherein a user account is cached with each of the multiple credentials and a step for associating a security measure with each of the multiple credentials, wherein the user is not authenticated to a service if the security measure of a particular credential is breached or the user account is locked.

However, Laursen disclose a method wherein some of the multiple credentials are stored on different stores, wherein the act of providing multiple credentials to an authentication service (abstract) further comprises one or more of:

a step for symmetrically associating the multiple credentials with the unique user identifier, wherein the user identifier is cached with each of the multiple credentials (col. 8, lines 4-35);

a step for symmetrically associating the multiple credentials with a user account, wherein a user account is cached with each of the multiple credentials (col. 8, lines 4-35) .

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh and Sweet as taught by Laursen in order to perform transactions or retrieve pertinent information without the need to key in such every time the transactions or the information are desired.

Neither Moreh and Sweet nor Laursen explicitly disclose a method wherein the authentication system is a distributed system and a step for associating a security measure with each of the multiple credentials, wherein the user is not authenticated to a service if the security measure of a particular credential is breached or the user account is locked. However, Wood discloses a method wherein the authentication system is a distributed system (col. 17, lines 15-25) and a step for associating a security measure with each of the multiple credentials, wherein the user is not authenticated to a service if the security measure of a particular credential is breached or the user account is locked (col. 10, lines 30-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Moreh, Sweet and Laursen as taught by Wood in order to provide enhanced security to the credential repository with location transparency.

51. As to claim 39, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 13.

52. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

53. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAN DEBNATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

Art Unit: 2135

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135